

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action issued on September 2, 2003. By this response, claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 15-21, 23, 25-27, 30, 32 and 33 are amended, and claims 7, 14 and 24 are cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is added. Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-23 and 25-33 are now active for examination.

The Office Action dated September 2, 2003 rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Larson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,904). The Examiner objected to the last claim for having a wrong claim number. It is noted that the Office Action was indicated as both Final and Non-final. As the Office Action is the first one issued in this application, it is believed that this Office Action is non-final. The Examiner is thanked for a telephone discussion to confirm this determination.

The obviousness rejection of the claims is respectfully traversed in view of the claim amendment and remarks presented herein.

The Rejection of Claims 7, 14 and 24 is Now Moot

By this response, claims 7, 14 and 24 are cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, the rejection of claims 7, 14 and 24 is now moot.

The Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-23 and 25-33 is Traversed

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-23 and 25-33 were rejected as being obvious over Larson. The obviousness rejection is traversed because Larson cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 1 and 17 describe a method and system for providing a user interface to solicit selection of desired service data, and transmitting the selected service data to a remote data processing system via a network. By this Response, claims 1 and 17 are

amended to further describe a process for generating a license code that is implemented to access the service data. The license code includes information related to a product code associated with a device or system. Appropriate support for the amendment can be found in, for example, page 14, last paragraph through page 15, first paragraph of the specification.

On the other hand, Larson discusses a server for providing specifications to a remote automotive service system. The server provides a user interface to allow a user at the remote automotive service system to select needed specifications. The server then retrieves and sends the needed specifications based on the selection. In order to verify the identity of the user and/or the service system, the server uses ID code, electronic key, payment verification, etc. to determine the identity of the user and/or service system.

Although Larson vaguely discusses using a hardware electronic security key to ensure that the automotive service system is authorized to access the specifications, Larson is silent about a process to generate a license code that is implemented for accessing the service data, by incorporating information related to the product code into the license code. Therefore, Larson fails to teach generating a license code with embedded information related to the product code for activating the desired service data, as described in claims 1 and 17. Since Larson fails to teach every limitation of claims 1 and 17, Larson cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness. The obviousness rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claims 1 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 18-22 depend on claims 1 and 17, respectively, and incorporate every limitation thereof. Therefore, Larson also fails to teach every limitation of claims

2-4 and 18-22 based on the same reasons for claims 1 and 17 as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, claims 2-4 and 18-22 are patentable over Larson. Favorable reconsideration of claims 2-4 and 18-22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 10 and 23 also are amended to describe a process for generating a license code that is implemented to access the service data. The license code includes a product code associated with a device or system. Appropriate support for the amendment can be found in, for example, page 14, last paragraph through page 15, first paragraph of the specification.

As discussed earlier relative to claims 1 and 10, Larson does not teach or suggest generating a license code with embedded information related to the product code for activating the desired service data. Thus, Larson fails to teach every limitation of claims 5, 10 and 23. Consequently, claims 5, 10 and 23 are patentable over Larson. Favorable reconsideration of claims 5, 10 and 23 is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 25 and 26, directly or indirectly, depend on claims 5, 10, 23, respectively, and incorporate every limitation thereof. Since claims 5, 10 and 23 are patentable over Larson, claims 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 25 and 26 are also patentable over Larson for at least the same reasons for claims 5, 10 and 23 as well as based on their own merits. Favorable reconsideration of claims 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 25 and 26 is respectfully requested.

Claims 27, 30 and 32 as originally filed describe generating a license code based on a product code, wherein the license code is implemented for accessing service. By this Response, claims 27, 30 and 32 are amended to clarify that the product code includes embedded information related to the product code.



As discussed earlier relative to claims 1 and 10, Larson does not teach or suggest generating a license code with embedded information related to the product code for activating the desired service data. Thus, Larson fails to teach every limitation of claims 27, 30 and 32. Claims 27, 30 and 32 are patentable over Larson. Favorable reconsideration of claims 27, 30 and 32 is respectfully requested.

Claims 28, 29, 31 and 33 depend on claims 27, 30 and 32, respectively, and incorporate every limitation thereof. Since claims 27, 30 and 32 are patentable over Larson, claims 28, 29, 31 and 33 are also patentable over Larson for at least the same reasons for claims 27, 30 and 32 as well as based on their own merits. Favorable reconsideration of claims 28, 29, 31 and 33 is respectfully requested.

The Objection is Addressed

The Examiner objected to the last claim of the current application for containing wrong claim number 31, rather than the correct number 33. By this Response, the claim number is corrected as suggested by the Examiner. The dependency of the claim is also amended to be depending on claim 32. It is respectfully submitted that claim 33 is now in proper form for examination. Favorable reconsideration of claim 33 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that this response addresses all issues raised in the Office Action. If any further issue should arise, which may be addressed in a telephone interview or by way of an Examiner's amendment, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone their representative at the number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY

Wei-Chen Chen

Wei-Chen Chen

Recognition under 37 CFR §10.9(b)

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 WC:apr
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: November 6, 2003